

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re RICKARD D. ANDERSON,) No. C 08-4674 SBA (pr) No. C 08-4978 SBA (pr)
) No. C 08-4841 SBA (pr) No. C 08-4979 SBA (pr)
) No. C 08-4977 SBA (pr)

**ORDER OF
DISMISSAL**

Plaintiff Rickard D. Anderson, a state prisoner and frequent litigant in federal court, filed the above-referenced "complaints" filled with nonsensical phrases with no clear relationship to each other. Section 1915A requires a federal court to engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer, or employee of a governmental entity. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The section applies even if the prisoner has not been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. See Rowe v. Shake, 196 F.3d 778, 781 (7th Cir. 1999) (joining Second, Fifth, Sixth and Tenth Circuits in holding that § 1915A applies even when prisoner pays full fee at outset). In its review the court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any claims which are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2).

Nowhere does Plaintiff assert identifiable causes of action or make coherent factual allegations that could give rise to a valid cause of action. In addition, Plaintiff has filed well over one hundred complaints in this Court since 2003, all of which have been unintelligible. The Court finds that Plaintiff's complaints are numerous and frivolous. It is difficult to ascertain from Plaintiff's complaints who he is seeking relief from or what relief he is seeking. These filings serve no reasonable litigation purpose, and they impose an unreasonable burden on the Court and its staff. Furthermore, based on Plaintiff's past history of failing to respond to this Court's orders to amend

1 unintelligible complaints, the Court finds that granting Plaintiff leave to amend would be futile.

2 Accordingly, Plaintiff's incomprehensible complaints are DISMISSED as frivolous because
3 they are without an arguable basis in law. See Jackson v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 641 (9th Cir.
4 1989) (a complaint that is totally incomprehensible is subject to dismissal as frivolous for lacking an
5 arguable basis in law). Any completed applications for leave to proceed in forma pauperis are
6 DENIED. All other pending motions are TERMINATED. The Clerk of the Court shall close the
7 files.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: 11/17/08

10 
11 SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4 RICKARD DENNIS ANDERSON et al,

Case Number: CV08-04674 SBA

5 Plaintiff,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

6 v.

7 / et al,

8 Defendant.
9 _____/

10 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
11 Court, Northern District of California.

12 That on November 20, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
13 copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said
14 envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle
15 located in the Clerk's office.

16 Rickard Dennis Anderson F-11871
17 Mule Creek State Prison
18 4001 State Highway 104
19 Ione, CA 95640

20 Dated: November 20, 2008

21 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
22 By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk
23
24
25
26
27
28